

October 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H13821

Miami would vault to second place in the movie industry. "It is easier," he explained, "to bring key New York actors to Miami than to California. Cost is lower, time is shorter, and the actors are more receptive to shooting anywhere than in California."

Actor empathy, however, is only a part of the answer. Ramon Navarro evidently liked South Florida. So, for "Tony Rome," did Frank Sinatra.

If it is to grow, the industry greatly needs local financing. If this is ever forthcoming in the manner that Wall Street at one time and the Bank of America at another gave Hollywood its wad, great things can be expected of Florida cinema.

Equally important is the labor requirement. Trained production crews are few outside of Hollywood. While the average age of production workers is 57 there and sweet-heart unions pass jobs down from father to son, the California industry is waking up and training younger people.

The Committee of 21 and the Florida Council have an understanding with Lindsey Hopkins School which may lead to significant adult training courses for movie technicians. Without an ample supply of skilled "grips" and other workers, a domed movie industry for South Florida is pleasant talk, and nothing else.

With these trained people and with a consortium of capital, such a development amid countless locations, modern facilities and a matchless, smog-free climate, is a mine of pure gold.

BUSINESS COMMUNITY GIVES ITS SUPPORT TO PRESIDENT'S NEW JOB PROGRAM

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, telegrams are pouring in from enthusiastic businessmen throughout the Nation, supporting President Johnson's new job program for the hard-core unemployed.

These farsighted businessmen realize, along with the President, that this Nation must not forget its rural and urban poor. They recognize the need of inducing private enterprise to invest its genius in our slums. They support the President's efforts to harness the energies of business and Government in a cooperative venture to bring jobs to the jobless, hope to the neglected, dignity to the oppressed.

The President's new program presents the business community with both a challenge and an opportunity—a challenge to its ingenuity, and an opportunity for public betterment along with private benefit. As the executive director of the National Rehabilitation Association put it:

American business large and small has been a willing and effective partner in assuring employment for the [physically and mentally] handicapped. This Association has confidence in the capacity of business to respond equally to this new challenge.

In offering their assistance to the President, private enterprise is vindicating their confidence President Johnson and this Nation have placed in their desire to improve life in our ghettos.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD a cross section of these telegrams to evidence the enthusiasm of the

business community for the President's new job program:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The National Rehabilitation Association expresses its appreciation for your proposal to bring the tremendous resources and initiative of the private enterprise system more directly into the national effort to master the problems of disadvantaged and otherwise handicapped people. We are convinced that the successful experience of public and private programs for the physically and mentally handicapped can be extended to reach and help those with other types of equally serious handicaps. Throughout the 47-year history of the vocational rehabilitation program American business large and small has been a willing and effective partner in assuring employment for the handicapped. This association has confidence in the capacity of business to respond equally to this new challenge. Let us add also our thanks for your splendid statement yesterday when you signed the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967.

E. B. WHITTEN,
Executive Director,
National Rehabilitation Association.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

Strongly support your business cooperative action program to promote training and jobs for hard core unemployed. Cooperation by Government with the private sector is essential in meeting this problem squarely. I stand ready to offer whatever assistance I can to assure success of this most important project.

CRONIN GARTLAND Co.,
ARTHUR D. CRONIN.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

Strongly support your big and small business cooperative action program to provide training and jobs for hard core unemployed. Cooperation between public and private sectors absolute necessity in meeting this problem squarely and quickly. I stand ready to offer what assistance I can.

CHARLES E. BAXTER,
President, Baxter Woolen Co., Inc.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The Society of American Florists, representing 211 affiliated grower, wholesaler and retailer florists associations throughout the country, supports fully the Small Business Administration's hard core employment program. We believe that cooperation of private and public groups is absolutely necessary to provide qualified workers for industries such as ours. Your support will be greatly appreciated.

JOHN H. WALKER,
Executive Director.

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MOSS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. BURTON of California (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BURTON of California's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR FURTHER IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions—both in this House and in talks with my constituents—I have noted that, while the reforms initiated in the Immigration Act of 1965—Public Law 89-236—removed many of the inequities in our heretofore archaic and discriminatory immigration laws, the present law still contains loopholes and shortcomings which must be corrected.

Numerous barriers still must be overcome by persons desiring to emigrate to our country or to adjust their status while already in the United States; families are still needlessly separated with little hope of being reunited in the near future; aliens serving with our Armed Forces in Vietnam must still cope with lengthy naturalization procedures. A wide variety of other additional inequities in our immigration policy are remnants of earlier, harsher measures.

I have already introduced legislation to alleviate the desperate situation of persons presently registered under the fifth-preference position of worldwide quotas, particularly those persons under the fifth preference of the Italian quota.

Today I am introducing a bill aimed at accomplishing a series of sweeping reforms—reforms which are urgently needed to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals.

At present, if an alien's application for an immigrant visa is not approved, he has no other legal recourse than to reapply at a later date or have a sympathetic Congressman request that the original application be reviewed. My bill will establish a Board of Visa Appeals, in the Department of State, which will be responsible for reviewing the denial of an immigrant visa to a relative of an American citizen or permanent resident alien, upon the petition of such citizen or alien.

Refugees are presently registered under the seventh-preference position of worldwide quotas and the number is not to exceed 6 percent of the overall annual limitation of 170,000. My bill establishes a new policy of granting asylum to refugees, removes them from seventh-preference status, and provides 12,000 immigrant visas annually to qualified refugees from all over the world.

My bill provides additional means to reunite families which have been separated. For example, parents of permanent resident aliens would enjoy second-preference status, rather than no particular status, as is presently the case.

These are just a very few of the many features of my bill which is aimed at facilitating and assisting persons to emigrate to our country rather than to make it almost impossible in some instances. I believe this legislation is long overdue. Aliens seeking to enter our shores have been humiliated and made to suffer indignities long enough.

October 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 13821

Miami would vault to second place in the movie industry. "It is easier," he explained, "to bring key New York actors to Miami than to California. Cost is lower, time is shorter, and the actors are more receptive to shooting anywhere than in California."

Actor empathy, however, is only a part of the answer. Ramon Navarro evidently liked South Florida. So, for "Tony Rome," did Frank Sinatra.

If it is to grow, the industry greatly needs local financing. If this is ever forthcoming in the manner that Wall Street at one time and the Bank of America at another gave Hollywood its wad, great things can be expected of Florida cinema.

Equally important is the labor requirement. Trained production crews are few outside of Hollywood. While the average age of production workers is 57 there and sweet-heart unions pass jobs down from father to son, the California industry is waking up and training younger people.

The Committee of 21 and the Florida Council have an understanding with Lindsey Hopkins School which may lead to significant adult training courses for movie technicians. Without an ample supply of skilled "grips" and other workers, a domified movie industry for South Florida is pleasant talk, and nothing else.

With these trained people and with a consortium of capital, such a development amid countless locations, modern facilities and a matchless, smog-free climate, is a mine of pure gold.

BUSINESS COMMUNITY GIVES ITS SUPPORT TO PRESIDENT'S NEW JOB PROGRAM

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, telegrams are pouring in from enthusiastic businessmen throughout the Nation, supporting President Johnson's new job program for the hard-core unemployed.

These farsighted businessmen realize, along with the President, that this Nation must not forget its rural and urban poor. They recognize the need of inducing private enterprise to invest its genius in our slums. They support the President's efforts to harness the energies of business and Government in a cooperative venture to bring jobs to the jobless, hope to the neglected, dignity to the oppressed.

The President's new program presents the business community with both a challenge and an opportunity—a challenge to its ingenuity, and an opportunity for public betterment along with private benefit. As the executive director of the National Rehabilitation Association put it:

American business large and small has been a willing and effective partner in assuring employment for the [physically and mentally] handicapped. This Association has confidence in the capacity of business to respond equally to this new challenge.

In offering their assistance to the President, private enterprise is vindicating their confidence President Johnson and this Nation have placed in their desire to improve life in our ghettos.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD a cross section of these telegrams to evidence the enthusiasm of the

business community for the President's new job program:

*The President,
The White House:*

The National Rehabilitation Association expresses its appreciation for your proposal to bring the tremendous resources and initiative of the private enterprise system more directly into the national effort to master the problems of disadvantaged and otherwise handicapped people. We are convinced that the successful experience of public and private programs for the physically and mentally handicapped can be extended to reach and help those with other types of equally serious handicaps. Throughout the 47-year history of the vocational rehabilitation program American business large and small has been a willing and effective partner in assuring employment for the handicapped. This association has confidence in the capacity of business to respond equally to this new challenge. Let us add also our thanks for your splendid statement yesterday when you signed the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967.

*E. B. WHITTEN,
Executive Director,
National Rehabilitation Association.*

*The President,
The White House:*

Strongly support your business cooperative action program to promote training and jobs for hard core unemployed. Cooperation by Government with the private sector is essential in meeting this problem squarely. I stand ready to offer whatever assistance I can to assure success of this most important project.

*GRONIN GARTLAND CO.,
ARTHUR D. CRONIN.*

*The President,
The White House:*

Strongly support your big and small business cooperative action program to provide training and jobs for hard core unemployed. Cooperation between public and private sectors absolute necessity in meeting this problem squarely and quickly. I stand ready to offer what assistance I can.

*CHARLES E. BAXTER,
President, Baxter Woolen Co., Inc.*

*The President,
The White House:*

The Society of American Florists, representing 211 affiliated grower, wholesaler and retailer florists associations throughout the country, supports fully the Small Business Administration's hard core employment program. We believe that cooperation of private and public groups is absolutely necessary to provide qualified workers for industries such as ours. Your support will be greatly appreciated.

*JOHN H. WALKER,
Executive Director.*

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MOSS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. BURTON of California (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BURTON of California's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR FURTHER IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions—both in this House and in talks with my constituents—I have noted that, while the reforms initiated in the Immigration Act of 1965—Public Law 89-236—removed many of the inequities in our heretofore archaic and discriminatory immigration laws, the present law still contains loopholes and shortcomings which must be corrected.

Numerous barriers still must be overcome by persons desiring to emigrate to our country or to adjust their status while already in the United States; families are still needlessly separated with little hope of being reunited in the near future; aliens serving with our Armed Forces in Vietnam must still cope with lengthy naturalization procedures. A wide variety of other additional inequities in our immigration policy are remnants of earlier, harsher measures.

I have already introduced legislation to alleviate the desperate situation of persons presently registered under the fifth-preference position of worldwide quotas, particularly those persons under the fifth preference of the Italian quota.

Today I am introducing a bill aimed at accomplishing a series of sweeping reforms—reforms which are urgently needed to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals.

At present, if an alien's application for an immigrant visa is not approved, he has no other legal recourse than to reapply at a later date or have a sympathetic Congressman request that the original application be reviewed. My bill will establish a Board of Visa Appeals, in the Department of State, which will be responsible for reviewing the denial of an immigrant visa to a relative of an American citizen or permanent resident alien, upon the petition of such citizen or alien.

Refugees are presently registered under the seventh-preference position of worldwide quotas and the number is not to exceed 6 percent of the overall annual limitation of 170,000. My bill establishes a new policy of granting asylum to refugees, removes them from seventh-preference status, and provides 12,000 immigrant visas annually to qualified refugees from all over the world.

My bill provides additional means to reunite families which have been separated. For example, parents of permanent resident aliens would enjoy second-preference status, rather than no particular status, as is presently the case.

These are just a very few of the many features of my bill which is aimed at facilitating and assisting persons to emigrate to our country rather than to make it almost impossible in some instances. I believe this legislation is long overdue. Aliens seeking to enter our shores have been humiliated and made to suffer indignities long enough.

H 13822

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 23, 1967

I commend our distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. CELLER] and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for taking the lead in sponsoring this much-needed legislation, and I am pleased to join them in this effort.

While this measure is directed toward instituting a vast number of needed reforms, there is one important area not covered—the question of the labor certification. Although the hope has been expressed that this subject will be considered during the course of hearings on the bill, it contains no specific language to this effect.

Under the provisions of the 1965 Immigration Act, all intending immigrants without preference must first secure approval, or a labor certification, from the Secretary of Labor, stating that their admission will not adversely affect American citizens similarly employed, before their applications for immigrant visas will even receive some initial consideration. Governmental studies have shown that the quality of immigration results in the creation of more jobs than the immigrants themselves take and, in many cases, the immigrants are highly skilled and can make major contributions to American science, technology, and industry.

Prior to December 1, 1965, the effective date of Public Law 89-236, the burden of proof rested with the Secretary of Labor, and an alien could enter the United States unless the Labor Secretary specifically said "No." At present, however, the labor certification requirement for third, sixth, and nonpreference immigrants stipulates that the Secretary grant specific approval that an alien's employment in this country will not adversely affect the domestic labor force. This procedure results in prolonged, often detailed, and generally unnecessary additional paperwork and administration of the alien employment certification program.

In a recent report, the Department of State informed me that—

This requirement [labor certification requirement] has made it more difficult for persons of all nationalities to obtain visas when they have no relatives in the United States who can confer on them a relative preference status which would exempt them from the labor certification requirement or when they cannot qualify to fill a job in a profession or occupation for which workers in the United States are in short supply.

This labor certification requirement has hit prospective Irish immigrants particularly hard. Statistics prove that section 212(a)(14) of the 1965 Immigration Act has caused a definite decrease in Irish immigration to the United States. For example, only 860 visas were issued to applicants to whom this section applied from December 1, 1965, through March 31, 1967. Of the over 6,000 Irishmen who made application for visas during the same period of time, only a little over 2,000, or one-third, actually received visas.

I cannot see why the Irish should be discriminated against, particularly when one considers the many outstanding contributions made to American science, religion, arts, and humanities, govern-

ment, and politics, industry, and technology by many Irish immigrants and their descendants. However, although the Irish have long been one of our largest groups of immigrants, they are now severely restricted as the great majority of those wishing to come to our country must apply for a labor certification in order to obtain permission to enter.

Unfortunately, we did not foresee this difficulty when we passed the 1965 Immigration Act in the 89th Congress, and I am sure our colleagues will agree, Mr. Speaker, that this inequity can and should be corrected with the greatest dispatch. Therefore, I am also introducing today a bill which amends section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The effect of this amendment will be to restore more flexibility to the current law's definition of "skilled workers" and restore the former labor provisions of the immigration laws prior to 1965. In addition, I have added a section to the Celler-Kennedy bill which calls upon the Department of Labor, in cooperation with the Departments of State and Justice, to conduct a thorough study of the operation and effect of the labor certification procedure and to report to the Congress on or before 6 months of the date of the bill's enactment.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we must realistically examine our immigration policies, and remove from our laws discriminatory practices and procedures of selecting immigrants, which amount to nothing more than a standing affront to millions of our citizens and our friends overseas. Public Law 89-236 went a long way but not far enough. Further legislative action is required to demonstrate to the world our dedication to equal and just treatment of immigrants, and I urge that my two bills receive expeditious and favorable consideration.

HOW THE MILITARY RULES 8 MILLION GREEKS

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is appalling to me that in all the time since democracy has been suspended in Greece and the Government in the hands of a military dictatorship, this country has lodged no formal complaint and, in fact, continues to send military aid under an agreement concluded with the now-deposed democratic regime.

The junta which took over in April has abolished any signs of democratic government and seems in no great hurry to restore any rights. Concentration camps have been activated, arrests have run into the thousands, and no area of personal or economic life remains free from surveillance.

I would like at this time to insert in the Record an article which appeared in the September 24, 1967, New York Times on the facts of "life" in Greece today.

AFTER THE ARRESTS: HOW THE MILITARY RULES 8 MILLION GREEKS

(By Maurice Goldbloom)

The military junta which seized power in Greece last April 21 is still nervous, but with each passing day it is less and less vulnerable. By now, neither a decision by King Constantine to break with it, nor a decision by the United States to cut off military aid would automatically topple it, though either would undoubtedly weaken it.

The attitude of most Greeks toward the King's role is summed up in a mot that has been going the rounds in Athens: "In the process of seduction, there is a point at which a girl must decide whether she is going to remain a virgin. The King has passed that point with the junta." In his recent appearances in the United States—in Washington with the President, in Newport for the America's Cup races—Constantine has apparently been acting as the regime's envoy. For its part, the United States, through its initial acquiescence, has given the junta the time it needed to dig in.

In other words, the junta, though not noticeably more popular, does seem to be more solidly entrenched. The coup was staged by no more than 200 to 400 officers—out of some 10,000 in the Greek Army. The ability of such a small group to seize power without significant opposition was largely the result of mistaken identity. Greeks had long been expecting—and right-wing Greeks had been hoping for—a coup by a large, nominally secret, but in fact well-known, organization dominated by senior officers known as IDEA. But over the years a small, rival organization of junior officers, called EENA, had been growing up almost unnoticed. At the time of the coup its leadership included only one general—Stylanos Patakos, now Minister of the Interior—and he had been made a brigadier only three months before. The group's most important leader was Col. George Papadopoulos—who happened also to be the man assigned by IDEA to transmit the orders for its coup to its followers throughout the army.

It was EENA that struck, but when Papadopoulos gave the signal its recipients thought they were obeying IDEA. Because there was no organized democratic group in the army, there was no military resistance. Because civilian political groups—including the weak and demoralized Communists—were prepared only for electoral activity, there was no popular resistance.

Once in, the junta lost no time in broadening its base of military support. Increasing the officer corps by approximately 10 per cent has enabled it to win the support of perhaps twice that many officers through promotions and new appointments. Key officers on whose loyalty it could not count were forced to retire. In the army, this purge for the most part took place immediately after the coup; in the navy, where the coup had received almost no support, the junta moved more slowly. Still, by mid-August more than 60 naval officers, mostly of high rank, were said to have been removed, and 11 to have been arrested.

Arrests, indeed, have been the junta's most conspicuous activity. The cases of former Premier George Papandreou of the Center Union, his son, Andreas Papandreou, and Mikis Theodorakis, composer of the score for "Zorba the Greek," have attracted worldwide attention, but there are thousands more, and the arrests show no signs of abating.

The original wave of arrests was based largely on an army list of suspects prepared nearly 20 years ago; the conspirators had been afraid to ask for more recent lists for fear of tipping their hand. Thus, many of those arrested in the first sweep were people who, whatever they might have been in the turbulent nineteen-forties, had long since ceased to be politically active.

Later arrests—which by now certainly outnumber those of the first wave—have been more selective. They affect all sections of the

October 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H13823

political spectrum, including parliamentary deputies, former Government ministers and several of the country's leading journalists. They also include a man who criticized the King in a telephone conversation with his sister, a bus driver who objected to letting a soldier ride free and numerous persons accused of such offenses as having five or more guests in their home or possessing a mimeograph and not registering it with the police.

Of those arrested at the time of the coup, more than 6,000 were sent to a hastily opened concentration camp on the island of Yiaros. (Some 1,500, most of whom had been arrested because of their official position rather than for their politics, were soon released, though many remained under house arrest.) The Government has now announced the opening of a second major concentration camp on the island of Leros, to which prisoners are being transferred from Yiaros. This should be an improvement.

Yiaros is a completely waterless and barren island, swept by high winds. Before the coup it had an old and unused prison, with cells for a few hundred persons. When the detainees were dumped on the island, the prison was used to house some of the women. The other prisoners were housed in tents, 25 to a tent, grouped in three camps.

Some weeks later, at a time when the Government claimed to have released about a third of the prisoners originally there, it announced plans to construct reservoirs on the island which would make it possible for each prisoner to receive 15 liters (a little less than 4 gallons) of water a day. Clearly, the water supply during the first several weeks must have been barely enough for drinking, let alone sanitation.

Later, other ameliorations were promised. These included an improvement in the diet, which was said to have consisted mainly of beans, and the opening of a canteen at which prisoners could purchase additional food and other small necessities. Some of these improvements may have taken place. If at least appears reasonably certain that the canteen was opened—since underground channels reported a few weeks later that it had been closed again.

There are inevitable gaps and time lags in information on conditions in the various places of detention, since Yiaros and most of the others have been barred to journalists and foreigners. A representative of the International Red Cross has, to be sure, been permitted to visit them. But in accordance with the normal practice of that organization, his report was submitted only to the Greek Government, which never made it public.

The Government did, however, release a letter in which the Red Cross representative asked on humanitarian grounds that the 250 women confined in the old prison on Yiaros be transferred elsewhere, to accommodations more appropriate to their sex. (The circumstances of this release were such that one is impelled to wonder if the Government really desired to give it wide publicity. In the Greek Government press office, official releases are normally laid out on tables, arranged in the order of the numbers which they bear. They are available in Greek, English and French. This release had no number, it was not with the others, and it was available only in Greek.) I have seen no report indicating that such a transfer has in fact taken place, although the women may be among those now being moved to Leros.

If conditions on Yiaros have improved in some elementary physical respects, it appears that they have recently become worse in other ways. Some 250 of the "most dangerous" prisoners are said to have been segregated from the others, and to be confined to their quarters 20 hours a day. During the four hours in which they are allowed out, the other prisoners are confined, in order to prevent any contact between the two groups.

And the three camps on the island are kept isolated from one another.

These changes probably result from the regime's disappointment at the failure of the prisoners to break down under its pressure. A condition for release is that the detainee sign a pledge to refrain from "antinational and anti-Governmental activity." Few politically significant prisoners have been willing to sign, regarding it as dishonorable.

Interior Minister Patakos complained to me: "Some of them are getting more hardened instead of reforming. They have organized by tents; a leader for each tent, and a group leader for each 8 or 10 tents. They have a president for each of the camps, and a general commander for the whole island. They have collected 250,000 drachmas [a little more than \$8,000] among themselves, for what purpose I do not know, but I am sure it is not a good one."

As one of the "Communist" leaders of the hardened prisoners, Patakos mentioned Dimitrios Stratis. When I remarked that the 78-year-old Stratis, a veteran trade-union leader and left-wing parliamentary deputy whom I know well, was not a Communist, Patakos replied: "He calls himself a Socialist, but he is a Communist. In Greece, we have right people and wrong people. All those who are against the country are Communists. Stratis is a Communist in his heart and his works. They are all liars."

Yiaros and the courts-martial which hand out sentences of five years for writing slogans on walls and eight years for *lese-majesté* are not the Government's only instruments of intimidation. Some Greeks beyond the borders have had their citizenship revoked—most notably, the actress Melina Mercouri, who seems to have come out ahead on the exchange.

Many persons regarded as potential troublemakers have been taken to police stations and badly beaten, as a warning, without being formally arrested; this treatment has been most often used on students and other young people. The security police have visited private employers with lists of "unreliable" individuals who are to be discharged. Many people have had their telephones removed because of their political views; all have been discouraged from talking politics on the phone or writing about it to friends by the knowledge that phones are likely to be tapped and letters opened.

But the junta has not relied on terror alone to consolidate its position. Rather, it has systematically endeavored to entrench itself in every aspect of Greek life. On the national level, despite the existence of a nominally civilian Government, an army officer plays a key role in every ministry—in some cases as minister, in others as secretary general, in still others as a political commissar without official title.

The tenure of civil servants has been abolished; many have been removed for their ideas, and all have been ordered to pledge their loyalty to the regime on pain of dismissal. The purge has not been confined to such politically sensitive departments as the police, where 118 high-ranking officials and police doctors were dismissed in mid-August. (Others had been ousted previously, individually or in smaller batches.) It has even affected the director of the Byzantine Museum, an internationally known scholar.

Locally, the regime has destroyed the system of nonpolitical nomarchs or district administrators, whose establishment American advisers once regarded as one of their major achievements. More than half the nomarchs have been removed; most of their replacements are army officers. While asserting its belief in the decentralization of authority, the Government has removed large numbers of elected mayors and local councils and replaced them with appointees chosen in Athens.

Nor has it confined itself to the govern-

mental sphere. It has seized control of the Orthodox Church. It has dissolved hundreds of private organizations and removed the officers of numerous others, including bar associations, agricultural cooperatives and the Jewish community.

The United States Embassy in Athens clearly does not like the regime, though most Greeks regard it as responsible for the coup—an opinion the junta assiduously encourages. (A skeptical friend remarked to me, after seeing one of the coup leaders in action, "Now I believe what you say about the Americans not being behind the coup; they'd never have chosen *these* people!") But the Embassy also regards the present Government as a lesser evil than a revolt against it, and has therefore placed its hope in persuading the junta to practice self-denial and restore democracy voluntarily. Its influence is limited, since the junta now feels certain that the United States will continue military aid whatever happens. (Some weeks after the coup, the U.S. did cut off certain items, estimated by the Defense Department at 10 per cent of the total.)

Nevertheless, the Embassy and State Department see great cause for optimism in the appointment of a committee of jurists to draw up a revised Constitution by the end of the year for submission to a plebiscite. This is supposed to lead to a speedy and orderly restoration of constitutional government.

This assessment appears to contain a large measure of wishful thinking. The group named to draw up the new Constitution included a few persons of some distinction, several conservative nonentities and a few with rather unpleasant reputations. But the members were not consulted before their appointments were announced, and some of the best-known have refused to serve.

The Government's influence on the deliberations of the committee is not likely to be cast on the side of democratic institutions. While Premier Constantine V. Kollias has said the new Constitution will be only slightly changed from the present one, journalists close to the junta have called for much more drastic alterations. Among the suggestions offered are a ban on political activity by anyone who has ever cooperated with the extreme left, a requirement that all candidates have loyalty certificates from the security police, and the exclusion from office of anyone who has ever held foreign citizenship.

The first of these provisions would not only bar all those in the United Democratic Left (EDA), a party which contains some hardcore Communists but also a wide range of non-Communists. It would also ban most members of Papandreu's Center Union and a number of people now on the right—including some ex-Communists who hold office under the junta or are among its advisers. (For example, Theophylaktos Papaconstantinou, whom the Government has placed in charge of the press, is a former Communist theoretician. So is the editor of Eleftheros Kosmos, the newspaper widely regarded as closest to the junta.)

The significance of the second is shown by a story told by a friend who had served as an officer attached to the general staff. One of his duties was to investigate the qualifications of officer candidates. In the dossier of one he found a report from the Security Police: "A. is a dangerous subversive, being closely associated with the politician Constantine Rendis." At the time of the report, Rendis, who belonged to the right-center, was Minister of Public Order and the superior of the police official who wrote it.

The third proposal is aimed primarily at Andreas Papandreu, a former American citizen and the man on whom millions of Greeks rest their hopes for their country's future.

When I asked Patakos what constitutional changes the Government would propose to the committee, he mentioned none of these

H 13824

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 23, 1967

specific points, although he referred in a general way to changes in the qualifications of deputies. In response to a question, he added that the Premier named by the King would still have to receive the support of a majority in Parliament. He added that these ideas were merely being considered very tentatively; the one point on which the Government was determined was that the new Constitution must cure all the faults of the existing system. Apprised of this statement, one diplomat remarked: "That's easy; all he has to do is change eight million Greeks."

Whatever kind of Constitution may emerge from the committee, the problem of implementation will still remain. The embassy appears to rely on the King and Patakos—the member of the junta who is regarded as most susceptible to the influence of the palace—to promote the restoration of a constitutional regime. Patakos, however, does not seem to have any such intention. He told me: "We are not interested in elections; if we were, we wouldn't have made a revolution. This system we have now is the best system, because what we have now we have achieved with the people's support, so there is no need for elections. We have more serious problems than elections. What we have done we did in order to achieve certain aims, and when we have achieved these aims, then we will have time for elections. . . . We are frank people. We are not liars and we do not want to make false elections, the way they do in Russia with 98 per cent; therefore there will be no elections."

But even if Patakos could be induced to support a prompt return to constitutionality, it is unlikely that he could accomplish it. Unlike Colonel Papadopoulos, who organized the coup, Patakos appears to have little talent for conspiracy or political infighting. He seems a basically decent if insensitive man, whose political naïveté is almost incredible. (He is responsible for most of the pronouncements which have brought ridicule on the junta—the bans on miniskirts, beards, long hair, etc.) A soldier of peasant origin (a brother is said to be still working on the roads in Crete), he rose slowly through the ranks for 37 years, becoming a brigadier general and commander of the tank school three months before the coup. Only then does he seem to have been brought into the conspiracy—because the tanks he controlled were necessary to its success. One suspects that he joined partly because of resentment at the establishment—civil and military—on which he blamed his slow promotion (he talks with obvious bitterness of the 10 years he lingered as a lieutenant colonel), and partly because he really believes the moralistic slogans to which others in the Government pay lip service.

In any showdown between Patakos and Papadopoulos, the latter seems far more likely to be the victor. Indeed, the other members of the junta may in any case drop Patakos when they feel strong enough to do so. He might even end up on Yiaros. If he should, I would not expect him to sign a declaration in order to obtain his release.

But if the junta does not seem likely to give up power voluntarily, there are factors which may eventually lead to its downfall. One is the difficulty of getting competent personnel to work for it. The population of Greece is about the same as that of New York City, and the proportion of trained personnel is much lower. If one eliminates a majority of the population—and a much larger majority of the well educated—on political grounds, it becomes difficult to find competent people for important positions. Moreover, many whom the junta might be willing to appoint do not want to serve under present conditions; in one instance, it has had to draft a retired official into the army in order to make him assume a top post in a ministry.

This difficulty may explain some of the peculiar appointments the Government has made. One, particularly strange for a regime which talks in terms of moral regeneration, is that of Constantine Thanos as Secretary General of the Ministry of Coordination and Alternate Governor of the World Bank, two of the most important economic posts it had to fill. Mr. Thanos was, a few years back, rejected for a teaching post at the University of Athens because it was discovered that the thesis he submitted in support of his application was a verbatim plagiarism from a memorandum by Prof. Benjamin Beckhart of Columbia. The incident is not the only one of its type in Mr. Thanos's career.

But the Government may well feel that it cannot look too closely into the moral credentials of anyone who can help it solve its economic problems, for these are very great, and almost certain to increase. At the beginning of June, Greece had short-term debts of about \$20-million more than its official gold and foreign-exchange reserves. (Some \$100-million in gold sovereigns, the purchase and sale of which were used to stabilize the currency internally, did not appear in the official reserves. The exact amount in this fund was secret.) And Greece's three principal sources of foreign exchange—emigrant remittances (about one Greek worker in five is employed abroad), tourism and shipping—all seem likely to drop sharply this year, as does foreign investment.

In addition, it is almost certain that a loan of about \$100-million which has been promised by the European Economic Community will now be postponed, if not canceled. Nor have the financial prospects been improved by the resignation of the internationally known economists Xenophon Zolotas and Michael Pasmazoglou as Governor and First Deputy Governor of the Bank of Greece.

No wonder that a former minister says of Col. Nicholas Makarezos, who as Minister of Coordination is in charge of economic policy: "He's the only one of them who thinks seriously about problems; that's why he always looks worried." The colonel's worries seem likely to come to a head within the next six months. By that time, the Government is widely expected to run out of cash. (It is already asking for U.S. economic aid.) It may be able to renew credits as they come due, simply because creditors will prefer to keep their loans on the books instead of pushing them into default. But without new credits, which seem unlikely, there will have to be drastic import restrictions and currency controls, there may be a devaluation of the drachma and a sharp reduction in the standard of living.

The political repercussions of such a development are unpredictable. It may be that the opposition will still be too disorganized to take advantage of the situation, and that the Government will be able to ride out the crisis. But it is also possible that students—who are difficult to control because their leadership is always being renewed—and workers returning from northern Europe, where many of them have already organized against the junta, will by then form the basis of an effective resistance movement. And if the regime is not able to keep up the standard of living of the armed forces—particularly the officer corps—trouble could come from that quarter.

Such a situation could conceivably result in a counter-coup. Or the junta might turn to a foreign adventure, particularly in Cyprus. This past summer, there were sounds from Athens of a new drive for *enosis*, the union of Cyprus with Greece. (They produced no sympathetic echoes among Greek Cypriots.)

Or the regime might seek to rally popular support by swinging in a Peronist or National Bolshevik direction. There are already some signs that it is considering this option. One is a decree prohibiting any Greek, including

employees of foreign companies and international organizations in Greece, from getting more in salaries, allowance and pensions than the Premier receives—about \$18,000 a year. (The junta issued a decree raising the salaries of Cabinet ministers substantially, but forbade the press to mention it. Some days later another decree was issued reducing the salaries—but to a point well above their previous levels. The reduction was then publicized without mentioning the previous raise.) It has also raised pensions for peasants by about two-thirds. And Agriculture Minister Alexander Matthalou's first radio address was not only filled with leftist phrases, but was couched in a form of the *Demotiki* (the popular language, traditionally championed by the left as against the *Katharevousa* or "pure" language backed by the right) so extreme that it is regarded as the trademark of the Communist party and shunned by everybody else. A move in this direction might also take on an antimonalarchical aspect; not all the members of the junta regard the King as indispensable.

It might seem strange for a rightist government to move in this direction. But the junta does not represent the traditional Greek right, rooted largely in property and birth. Its leaders are men of lower and middle-class background. They may hate the left, but they have no love for the conservative establishment.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967

(Mr. PICKLE (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the conference agreements reached on the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. In general, I supported the purposes of this act throughout its legislative history, and, in fact, spoke on this floor in support of improved public television back when the bill was first introduced.

There has been very little argument that something is needed to supplement the programming of the commercial stations. Without noncommercial television, we have an inflexible situation by which a certain segment of the viewing public is deprived of its choice of television. Certainly we cannot cater to every taste, but when the kind of program being squeezed out is so valuable, then I think it is time we reevaluated the system. The Public Broadcasting Act does this, and I think it is a good step toward the goal of good, noncommercial programming.

With the Federal Government already involved in this field, and with it becoming even more involved by virtue of this act, I think it is important that safeguards be erected to prevent the law from being used for something not intended. I think it should be clear that the programs envisioned by the act are not to compete with the type of broadcasting usually seen on commercial stations today. We have got to be careful to insure that the noncommercial broadcasts do not threaten the welfare of other stations, especially those on UHF channels, and to insure that political promotions are removed from the sphere of Government-supported activities.

To my way of thinking, it is sound legislative policy to define as clearly as pos-

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished and able colleague from New York for an able and timely statement to the House.

Mr. RYAN. I appreciate the gentleman's expression of support.

THE UNDECLARED WAR ON J. P. STEVENS & CO.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received, as I assume other Members did, a copy of a statement by Mr. Robert T. Stevens, delivered before a subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee. I read it. The testimony given by the president of J. P. Stevens & Co. contained some shocking revelations. It revealed a 4-year undeclared war that has been waged against the Stevens Co. by the Textile Workers Union of America, aided and abetted by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO. By documentation the statement leaves no doubt that the National Labor Relations Board has, without reason, thrown its weight against the textile firm. This presents a formidable array of power against one employer.

A few days earlier I received, as I am sure others did, a copy of a pamphlet entitled "The Hollow Promise," which apparently was designed to give the union's side in the war I have referred to. I also read it. Unfortunately it contains many generalities and emotional appeals, and is quite lacking in factual data to support charges and assumptions that it contains. It depicts much thunder but little lightning.

The war against the Stevens Co. began in 1963. Since then the news media have carried many stories about the persistent efforts to unionize the plants. Scores of insertions have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding various aspects of the struggle. In addition, one committee hearing has been conducted.

Mr. Speaker, since the attempt to unionize Stevens is unique in many respects, characterized by some rather unbelievable techniques, I have undertaken to examine all the evidence available on the subject and have attempted to compose an objective report on the case. The impact of the ultimate outcome of this effort to unionize employees of the Stevens Co. will be felt by both workers and employers throughout the country.

To begin with, the right of collective bargaining is basic. It is a cherished privilege that is accorded to workers and employers, and the right must be properly observed and protected. But collective bargaining is inherently a voluntary privilege, not a mandate in any sense of the word. It has been said, and correctly so, that when workers voluntarily join a labor union the workers control the union; but if their joining is compulsory, then the union controls the workers.

STEVENS WORKERS OPPOSE BEING UNIONIZED

The J. P. Stevens Co. operates 71 plants and employs some 44,000 workers. It is an old, well-established, and efficiently operated concern, which has provided a

market for natural fibers and employment for a vast number of people in the manufacture of textiles. It appears that a larger majority of the workers do not want to join the union. In fact, the union's effort to organize them in some 25 plants has been defeated in elections held at every plant selected by the union for tests. Yet, despite this repeated expression on the part of the workers, the union continues to demand unionization, and in pursuing this course has resorted to some highly questionable tactics.

This effort by the Textile Workers Union of America has been underway since 1963. Four cases charging unfair labor practices have been filed against the company. In each instance, the NLRB found the company guilty. Moreover, the second circuit court of appeals not long ago upheld the verdict against the company in the first case, initiated in 1964.

UNFAIR PUBLICITY

As a result of the suits and the verdicts against it, the Stevens Co. has received much unfavorable publicity. The ruling of each trial examiner has been widely reported. So were the NLRB rulings and the decision by the second circuit. The company has really taken some heavy punches.

In addition, the Stevens firm appears to have been roundly assailed during hearings before a congressional committee. Even the special counsel of the committee, Prof. Dan Pollitt, of the University of North Carolina, has gone far beyond the call of duty to publicly take Stevens to task.

In many letters received by Members of Congress, and in the news media, union members have also denounced Stevens. William Pollock, president of the Textile Workers Union, in his testimony before the committee, pulled out all the stoppers in a castigation of the company and for good measure gratuitously included almost the entire southern textile industry because the majority of the southern textile workers are not organized. Pollock made it quite clear that was what he was mad about. Indeed the union leader blamed most of the economic ills of the South—going back to the Civil War period—on the nonunion status of the textile industry and other southern industries. He made it quite clear that he does not believe in voluntary unionism.

The company has been smeared and must have been injured, along with the entire southern textile industry, few of whose workers have chosen to join unions. An objective observer would, I believe, conclude that it has been a ruthless and rather vicious war that has been waged against this concern.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY HARD PRESSED

Staying in business and making a success in the textile business has certainly been no bed of roses in recent years. Many have not survived. Much of this trouble has been due to excessive imports. The textile business is a major industry and employs nearly a million people, but seems a stepchild insofar as the Federal Government is concerned. A rather large number of us in the Congress, representing districts where mills are located and where the natural fibers are grown, have been quite active in recent years in efforts

to keep this industry from going under. We have encountered formidable resistance in the State Department. The so-called Kennedy round of trade agreements lowered textile duties, and did harm to the stability of our domestic industry. And on top of all this, labor problems have been aggravated by Government agencies which have actively helped the unions in their efforts to unionize textile workers even when they do not want to be organized.

It naturally follows that Stevens officials have been forced to take much of their valuable time, at great expense, to deal with these attempts. And Government activities have added to this burden. Federal power can be awesome, and when combined with the union powerhouse the struggle becomes very unfair and lopsided.

In meeting this combination the Stevens Co. has shown remarkable courage. It has tenaciously stood by its employees. The firm is reported to have told its employees that they had a right to join a union if they wished to, but also told them it did not believe they would be benefited if they did join. This was in keeping with the finest traditions of industry-employee relationship in a free society. But, amazingly, in the eyes of the union officials and of the NLRB, such expressions constitute a major sin. STEVENS WORKERS ARE HAPPY AND SATISFIED

It should be pointed out that Stevens enjoys a reputation as a progressive company. It commands the respect and gratitude of its employees. Since 1963 the workers at eight plants have voted down the union. One rerun election was held, with the same result.

When one takes into account the circumstances under which the elections were held, the results become very significant. The union had the choice of locations; that is, it could select the plants where there seemed to be the best prospects for victory. The Textile Workers Union has at its command major resources, and can draw upon the tremendous wealth and other resources of the AFL-CIO. The press reported that George Meany, president of AFL-CIO, went to the White House to urge the President to take punitive action against Stevens by canceling all the company's Government contracts. So determined is the union that it would resort to measures designed to weaken the company economically, and jeopardize the jobs of thousands of workers, in order to gain a victory to the liking of the union leaders. And it must be kept in mind that throughout this entire struggle the union as had the benefit of a powerful agency, the NLRB, in efforts to unionize.

NLRB EXAMINERS BIASED

Let us take a look at what the NLRB has done in this war. I have said that all four NLRB trial examiners ruled against Stevens after hearing many witnesses and after lengthy deliberation. Despite the time employed, the examiners reached their conclusions by a fantastic process of reasoning which made a farce of what was supposed to be a deliberate and objective proceeding. What did the trial examiners come up with? Believe it or not, they decided that the company

October 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 13809

self—and, in fact, there were provisions in the enabling legislation for State assumption of part of the costs of retiring the 30-year bond issue which financed the project. Remarkably, the turnpike not only cost the general taxpaying public in Colorado nothing, but it even produced so much revenue that the four-lane, high-speed route became part of the State public highway system nearly 15 years ahead of schedule.

That was what the ceremony at Broomfield was all about. Excerpts from a special section of an outstanding newspaper in my district, the Boulder Daily Camera, telling some of the high points of this remarkable success story, follow:

TURNPIKE: TREMENDOUS IMPACT ON BOULDER
(By Dick Walberg)

"This Boulder toll road proposition is nothing in the world but a special interest deal to make more soft jobs at the expense of the hard working taxpayers."

So wrote a business consultant and announced gubernatorial candidate of the turnpike in 1949 before legislation was passed making the four-lane, limited-access highway possible.

His remarks were representative of the emotional antagonism aroused by the Boulder-inspired proposal to build a thoroughfare linking Boulder directly with the state capital. Because those were tax-lean years, the proposal called for the construction to be financed by bonds to be retired with tolls collected from the users. To make the bond issue attractive to big lenders, a clause in the enabling legislation provided the State Highway Department, if tolls were insufficient, would pay up to 30 per cent of the annual cost of retiring the bonds.

It was this clause that made the far-sighted dream of Prof. Roderick Downing, "father of the turnpike," a reality and it was this clause that gave license to opponents to open a broadside attack against the proposition. But now, 18 years later, the ironic fact is that the Boulder-Denver turnpike is the only major traffic facility in the state built at no cost to the general taxpaying public.

Since it was opened on Jan. 19, 1952, the entire cost of the turnpike has been paid by the dimes and quarters of motorists using the highway. Over the years more than 44 million vehicles have piled the 17.3-mile high-speed highway and the clink of silver has totaled more than \$10.5 million.

Thursday marks an end to the tolls.

An 11 a.m. ceremony will commemorate the turnpike's unique new status of being the nation's only toll road that is a part of a public roads system to be paid off and become toll-free.

The occasion will bring Charles Brady, head of the American Auto Association, from his Washington office. James F. Ellis, chairman of the State Highway Commission, will serve as head of the celebration. Members of the 35th and 37th General Assemblies will be invited, with special recognition to be accorded William L. Paddock and Leslie R. Steele, the Boulder representatives, and Frank L. Gill, Hillrose senator, who sponsored the turnpike legislation back in 1947 and 1949.

For two Boulder Chamber of Commerce officials, leaders in the fight for the turnpike from the start, the commemoration will be especially rewarding. One is Frank Henderson, chairman of the chamber's highway advisory committee, and the other, Francis W. Reich, the chamber's veteran manager.

These men, together with A. A. Paddock and Frank Jamison and a handful of others, campaigned tirelessly for the proposed traffic facility. Theirs was the hard sell, pitched like today's TV commercial for a laundry detergent.

Their claims:

Boulder would receive \$44 million in benefits from the turnpike during the anticipated 30 years of tolls believed required to pay off the construction bonds.

The facility would be a boon to all segments of the Boulder economy and would revolutionize Boulder's way of life.

Travel between Boulder and Denver would increase 30 per cent.

200 lives would be saved in 30 years by driving "Tomorrow's Highway—Today" rather than the narrow, hazardous U.S. 87-287 north out of Denver and State Highway 7 west into Boulder.

Motorists using the superhighway would actually save money because the turnpike would cut off 7 miles on the trip to Denver, and at a nickel a mile for operating a car the net saving would be 15 cents.

These were some of the more brash claims; now nearly two decades later, how do they stack up?

Assessable property in Boulder has jumped from \$14 million in 1950 to \$101 million, better than a seven-fold increase. County property assessments increased five-fold to \$240 million.

City building permit valuations rose from \$3½ million to \$20 million. Retail sales climbed from \$22 million to \$135 million. Bank resources from \$20 million to \$100 million. Population went up from 20,000 to 56,000.

Travel on the turnpike the first year more than doubled the projected average daily count of 2,200 and by last year had reached 13,774.

31 fatalities have occurred on the turnpike since it opened or about 3.9 per 100 million miles of travel. The national average for traffic fatalities is 5.67 per 100 million miles.

And, while the toll has remained unchanged at a dime and a quarter, the cost of operating a motor vehicle has more than doubled so that the net saving per trip is even greater than projected.

Actually no yardstick can measure the impact of the turnpike, on Boulder, for who can isolate its effect on the community from the welter of other influences? But there is no denying the impact has been tremendous. Reich, who has had his thumb on the pulse of Boulder for 31 years as manager of the chamber, weighs the turnpike along with the University as the two things most influential in shaping Boulder.

"Without the turnpike," he said, "we simply would not have the facilities and development we now have. Before it was constructed Boulder was at the stub end of a side road; the advent of the highway gave Boulder direct access to Denver's suppliers, transportation terminals and other facilities needed to attract desirable industries to the area."

JIM EVANS, PATRIOTIC BROADCASTER

(Mr. KUYKENDALL (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, while a few thousand malcontents did their best to disrupt the Nation's Capital and the Pentagon on Saturday, there was one courageous voice speaking out for America. Jim Evans, whose program is broadcast over radio station WMAL from 10 to 2 every day, used the time on Saturday to remind Americans of the glories of this great country of ours and of the rich heritage which has been bought for this generation by the sacrifices of our fearless and dedicated forefathers.

While those gathered at the Lincoln Memorial and the Pentagon displayed the enemy flags of the Vietcong and called for the defeat of our troops who are fighting aggression and tyranny, Evans played some of the stirring patriotic melodies which lift up the hearts of those who sincerely believe in freedom and justice.

I just want to take this moment to pay tribute to Jim Evans and applaud the many fine statements he made Saturday in support of the American dream. His effort was a far greater contribution toward world peace and justice for all men than the hate-filled slogans chanted by those anti-Americans taking part in the disgraceful display at the Pentagon.

(Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. TALCOTT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

EGYPTIAN ATTACK ON ISRAEL DESTROYER

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the outrageous attack upon, and the sinking of the Israel destroyer *Elath* by Egypt is the most flagrant violation of the cease-fire in the Middle East. The Israeli ship was 13½ miles out in international waters. As Israel Foreign Minister Abba Eban said, Egypt should be condemned by world public opinion.

This incident illustrates more clearly than ever the need for true peace in the Middle East which must be achieved through direct negotiations.

As long as there is only a cease-fire or a temporary armistice, there are likely to be other incidents with further tragic losses. The way to prevent recurrences is to have a final peace settlement in the Middle East arrived at by the nations involved through direct negotiations on all issues.

The United States, other peace-loving nations, and the United Nations must make every effort to secure such a peace settlement as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the sinking was accomplished by the use of sea-to-sea missiles supplied by the Soviet Union and fired from one of Egypt's 15 PT-type boats. The accuracy was such that it raises a serious question as to whether Soviet experts were overseeing and supervising the actual operations.

The Soviet Union's role in providing armaments to Egypt since the end of the war is a most dangerous one. The introduction of increasingly sophisticated weapons by the Soviet Union into the explosive Middle East only compounds the difficulty of achieving a peace settlement and increases the risk of nuclear warfare.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

H13802

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 23, 1967

503d MP Battalion was brought out of the building and moved toward the crowd. The platoon had to crawl through manmade rope fences and became somewhat disorganized after going through the fences. One squad of the platoon was as much as 75 yards in front of the rest and were quickly surrounded by the demonstrators.

The protesters pushed and shoved these MP's and then for some unknown reason the squad leader marched the squad back past the platoon and into another group of demonstrators rather than back into platoon position. There heavy scuffling started. On two different occasions the peaceniks had a soldier on the ground and were beating them. The demonstrators were pulled off by other soldiers and other protesters. In all fairness, this was not a vicious crowd, or they could have possibly stomped some of the MP's to death if they had wanted to. On the overall operation, the military and marshals did a splendid job, and I noticed especially the individual bravery of the soldiers in the trapped platoon. But, in my opinion, more riot training is needed by this unit.

The thoughts that were going through my mind during the 3 hours I observed the demonstration were what effect this would have on our gallant soldiers now fighting in Vietnam, what kind of image this would help to create in the eyes of the rest of the world, and what the cost to the taxpayers would be for all the elaborate preparations made at the Pentagon to repel the demonstration.

I hope that our Government will not permit this cheap show to come to town again.

USE OF SOVIET SURFACE-TO-SURFACE GUIDED MISSILE TO SINK ISRAEL SHIP

(Mr. BOB WILSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there are very serious implications for the United States in the use of a Soviet surface-to-surface guided missile to sink an Israel ship. This is the first time in history that a Russian radar-controlled missile has been used to sink a ship of any flag. If the Soviets are prepared to equip and assist the Egyptians to blow up an Israel destroyer in international waters during a United Nations ceasefire agreement, for which Soviet Russia voted, may we not consider that similar naval missiles will be provided to North Vietnam for use against the ships of the U.S. Navy?

It will be too late to issue warnings if a Soviet-built "Komar" or "Ossa" missile boat appears off Haiphong or the DMZ and sinks a U.S. aircraft carrier with thousands of American sailors. This would be intolerable. The issue would no longer rest on whether or not Soviet Red naval personnel actually pushed the button.

Admiral Moorer, the U.S. Navy Chief of Operations, has stated that it was obvious that Soviet sophisticated weaponry was used in the sinking of the Israel destroyer *Elath*.

The attack took place almost simultaneously with the arrival in Cairo of the Soviet Deputy Minister of Defense and a large military delegation from Moscow including naval, air force, and army officers. An estimated 8,000 Soviet military advisers and technicians were already in Egypt. Among them were Red navy personnel advising the Egyptian crews on board the Soviet naval ships and submarines provided to the Nasser regime.

The Israel Government seems to have suffered even more provocation than the North Vietnamese naval attack on our destroyers in the summer of 1964 that led to our Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Here we have the case of an extreme escalation in which the Soviet Union has provided and possibly actually fired a surface-to-surface naval missile to sink a ship. It was an attack involving the highest degree of electronic and missile skills as well as a very new and sophisticated Soviet missile.

Moscow may well be testing to determine the U.S. attitude toward use by Soviet satellites of naval missiles. They chose the Arab-Israel area to make this test because of a belief that the United States would seek to avoid a confrontation because of the administration's ambiguous and vague commitments to Israel. Moscow knows that our policymakers are eager to restore relations with the Arabs. The Communists know that they have been able to resupply the Arabs with even more modern weapons than those lost in the June war—without the United States keeping its commitment to sell a limited number of military jets to Israel.

The lack of American firmness in the Middle East may cause that region to erupt again into a war less easy to stop than the 6-day conflict. The presence of Russian men and ships could cause the conflict to escalate in a manner disadvantageous to both Israel and the United States.

The Port Said base in Egypt, now used by the Russians, was the source of the guided missile attack on the Israel ship.

It seems as if the Russians are going to make Port Said into a second Haiphong for a test case to see whether they can establish a privileged sanctuary in the Mediterranean. If they win this show of strength, the lesson will not be lost on the Arabs and the Mediterranean peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Soviet Union is taking advantage of our preoccupation in Vietnam and rifts in NATO to make a long end run into the eastern Mediterranean aimed at that region in addition to the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean. The strategic factors are obvious. More than oil is at stake.

We must immediately make known to the Russians that they should not miscalculate on our intentions. Last spring the Russians ordered the U.S. 6th Fleet to leave the Mediterranean. They then incited and armed the Arabs, to use the Arab states as a proxy force, to turn the Mediterranean into a virtual Russian lake. Thanks to the Israeli military victory, the Russians suffered a setback.

Moscow immediately embarked on a propaganda campaign at the United

Nations and a massive military training and resupply operation in the Arab world. The administration's response was confined to a belief that only Vietnam and China were a real threat to our security.

Before it is too late, we must serve notice on the Russians that there are limits to their manipulations and escalations in the Middle East. The very least we must do is to supply the Israelis with effective weapons to counter the new Soviet-Arab offensive buildup.

SECOND HEADQUARTERS LABORATORY FOR FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

(Mr. MACHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to House Report No. 801 which was filed on Friday after being reported out by the House Committee on Government Operations.

This report deals specifically with the procedures, or lack of them, of the Food and Drug Administration in selecting an alternate site for construction of its second headquarters Laboratory. While contending that it wanted to build on property it owns and adjacent to existing facilities in Beltsville, Md., the FDA buckled and said if it could not build in Beltsville, Md., it would build the proposed \$17 million Laboratory in Madison, Wis. This decision was made despite the fact that an FDA study in 1966 for the House Appropriations Committee showed that it would cost the taxpayers \$5.4 million more to build in the Midwest.

Contrary to a report last Friday, October 20, 1967, in the Washington Daily News, the Maryland and Virginia Congressmen were not out to lunch when the House approved a rider that would force the laboratory to be built in Madison, Wis. At the time that the appropriation bill for the FDA was being considered, I offered an amendment to strike the rider that would force construction of the laboratory to a site outside a 50-mile radius of Washington, D.C. This is the rider that was proposed in committee by the ranking minority member of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, a man whose reputation for economy is well known in this body.

However, this reputation does not transcend public works projects such as the second headquarters laboratory for the FDA. The 50-mile rider which was left in the bill after my amendment to delete it was defeated could cost the taxpayers approximately \$135,000 a word, as I pointed out during the debate on my amendment. If this is a demonstration of the type of economy that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are sponsoring then I fear we will need a 25-percent tax surcharge to make up the deficit in the budget that they would have us incur.

It is typical of the Republican Party, as so clearly demonstrated with the 50-mile rider for the added \$5.4 million in cost to the taxpayers, that economy and efficiency in government are fine as long

October 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 13801

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Schadeberg.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Cormann with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Button.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Roush.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Poage with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Pickle.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Rogers of Florida.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 12603, NATIONAL VISITORS CENTER ACT OF 1967

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 12603, the National Visitors Center Act of 1967.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I understand that the report is in the process of being prepared, and it is understood that the minority will have an opportunity to review it prior to its being filed.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We shall, as we have in the past, consult with the minority before the report is filed before midnight.

Mr. CRAMER. With that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

JEWISH UNIT SAYS TWO GROUPS SPREAD ARAB HATE

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of Congress to an article that appeared in this morning's edition—October 23, 1967—of the New York Times.

This news story clearly indicates how hate organizations become captives of and prey to propaganda designed to build up ill will, opposition and hate against individuals, nationalities and nations. This is accomplished by simply parroting reams of false and misleading charges that constantly bombard the public and the press.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has effectively and persuasively exposed this activity. This organization and its national director of the league, Mr. Benjamin R. Epstein deserve the commendation of all fair minded people for performing this most useful service.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place the article at this point in the RECORD.

JEWISH UNIT SAYS TWO GROUPS SPREAD ARAB HATE—ANTI-DEFAMATION BODY ASSERTS SNCC AND STATES RIGHTS PARTY ARE BOTH RACIST

(By Irving Spiegle)

HOUSTON, October 22.—The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith today accused two racist groups, one antiwhite and the other antinegro, of disseminating Arab-sponsored, "gutter level propaganda" in this country against Jews and Israel.

Benjamin R. Epstein, national director of the league, who made public a study containing the charges, named the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee and the National States Rights party as the groups in question.

Mr. Epstein described the student committee as a "black racist and left-wing revolutionary organization" and its "polar opposite, N.S.R.P.," as "neo-Nazi white racist."

The study declared that the two groups were circulating propaganda materials produced by the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestine Arab Delegation.

The Arab groups, the league said, are registered with the United States Government as agents for foreign powers, under regulations of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

THREE-DAY MEETING ENDS

The report highlighted the closing session at the Warwick Hotel of a three-day meeting of the league's national executive committee, the policy-making body of the organization. The league seeks to safeguard the civil and religious rights of Jews here and abroad, and also plays a strong role in the civil rights movement.

Mr. Epstein charged that the S.N.C.C. newsletter and the states rights party's publication, Thunderbolt, showed almost "word-for-word dependence" on Arab propaganda material against Jews, Zionism and the State of Israel.

He said that S.N.C.C.'s newsletter "parroted whole sections of a 1966 Palestine liberation organization diatribe produced in Beirut, Lebanon," while the Thunderbolt reproduced whole paragraphs from a Palestine Arab delegation polemic issued last July 14.

Mr. Epstein exhibited pages of printed material that both American groups had culled from Arab propaganda publications.

For instance, the Palestine Liberation organization asserted that "the Jewish state [Israel] was planted at the point of intersection of Asia and Africa without the free approval of any Middle Eastern, Asian or African country, except the Union of South Africa, itself ruled by an alien minority."

SAME SENTENCE USED

In the S.N.C.C. newsletter, the same sentence appears.

The Thunderbolt quoted almost verbatim from the Palestine Arab pamphlet, which charged Jews with war crimes and genocide.

The league study described the Palestine liberation organization as a "notorious and extremist Arab propaganda apparatus, nascently terminated by Ahmed Shukairy, a long-time Arab spokesman who has engaged in anti-Jewish tirades on the floor of the United Nations and elsewhere."

The Palestine delegation, the league said, is the group headed by Haj Amin El-Husseini, the former grand mufti in Jerusalem who supported Hitler during World War II.

The study said that the Palestine liberation organization had offices in New York City and operated "on a million-dollar-a-year budget provided by the Arab League."

The study said the group was under the direction of Izzat Tannous, a Palestinian Arab who has acted as a spokesman for Arab refugees at the United Nations.

Mr. Epstein said that the use of Arab materials placed S.N.C.C. "at the disposal of Arab propagandists as an overeager handmaiden."

He also charged that the National States Rights Party was a "notorious, anti-Jewish and anti-Negro group."

Mr. Epstein said that the party was organized in Knoxville, Tenn., in 1958 and now operated out of Savannah, Ga. Its philosophy, he said, is "neo-Nazi."

REPORT ON ANTI-VIETNAM WAR DEMONSTRATION AT PENTAGON

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 21, for a period of approximately 3 hours, I observed firsthand the antiwar demonstrators at the Pentagon. Because of your interest in this demonstration, I would like to relay to you my observations.

At about 3:45 p.m. the crowds began to build up and were pushing toward the line of military police. Members of the 503d MP Battalion plus U.S. marshals were holding the crowd back. At 4:15 p.m. several demonstrators broke through military police and confronted several marshals who properly and quickly used their nightsticks to control the demonstrators. The U.S. marshalls handled themselves very well. However, they seemed rougher than the soldiers. Around 5 p.m. a platoon marched out of the Mall entrance of the Pentagon as reinforcements. The show of new strength caused the crowd to yell and holler. I noticed that no soldier had his weapon loaded but did have ammunition available on his belt. Considering the crowd and demonstrators involved, this, in my opinion, was the proper procedure of handling the ammunition. I would estimate about 40,000 people present at the most; possible 5,000 were actually hardcore antiwar demonstrators, another 5,000 were lukewarm protestors, and the other 30,000 were there for entertainment. Some had even brought a football and were playing touch football during the lull.

Around 5:30 p.m., possibly 70 or 80 demonstrators broke through a line of U.S. marshals and did enter the building but were quickly thrown out by marshals and soldiers. Between 5:30 and 6 about 2,000 demonstrators started walking toward the Pentagon. A platoon of the